



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Sc

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,370	04/26/2001	Lujun Chen	S01.12-0730/STL_9852	9242
7590	09/14/2004		EXAMINER	
Brian D. Kaul WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY International Centre-Suite 1600 900 South Second Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319				MILLER, BRIAN E
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2652
DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/843,370	CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian E. Miller	2652

All Participants:

Status of Application: AF

(1) Brian E. Miller. (3) _____.

(2) Brian Kaul. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 September 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 in view of Mao et al

Claims discussed:

none specifically

Prior art documents discussed:

US 6,619,647

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant argued in the After Final response that the Mao et al reference is not prior art under the guidelines with respect to the same assignee and 103(c) under applications filed on or after November 29, 1999. The Examiner has ordered the provisional application of the instant application, i.e., 60/233,815, to review it to see if the guidelines have been met. After review, an appropriate Office Action will follow..